DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 900 JC 830 121

AUTHOR Reeb, Richard H.
TITLE Of Calendars and Education.
INSTITUTION Barstow Coll., Calif.
PUB DATE 14 Jan 80
NOTE 33p.; Prepared by the Office of Instructional Services.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Costs; *Educational Trends; Enrollment Influences; *Organizational Change; *Quarter System; School Holding Power; School Registration; *Semester System; Student Attitudes; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

The question of which calendar is best for Barstow College (BC) is addressed in terms of general considerations connected with academic calendars, the intended effects of the quarter system, the issue of cost effectiveness, and the advantages and disadvantages of both calendars. First, introductory material discusses BC's conversion to a quarter system in 1971 and subsequent research efforts to analyze the effects of the change. Part I places the calendar issue into perspective discussing the relationship of calendar to institutional mission, financial considerations, patterns of calendar use among two-year colleges, and the origins of the quarter system in the summer school movement. Part II reviews arguments made on behalf of the quarter system, e.g., students have more opportunity for electives and academic exploration and the system better matches students' attention span. Part III focuses on the cost effectiveness of the quarter system, looking at statistics showing changes in student retention and enrollment at BC and citing the direct and indirect costs to students and the institution of three rather than two registrations. Part IV cites and analyzes the 11 reasons supporting BC's conversion to the quarter calendar. The report concludes that BC should reconvert to the semester system, as it is more conducive to effective teaching and learning and it saves students and the institution the costs of an additional registration. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Office Of Instructional Services

ED227900

OF CALENDARS AND EDUCATION

BY

Richard H. Reeb

Barstow College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIO..AL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard Reeb, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JC 830 121

January 14, 1980

INTRODUCTION

At one time, the quarter calendar at Barstow College was a hot issue on campus, especially among faculty members. For several years after its adoption in 1971, the new calendar stirred criticism that it gave teachers and students less time to cover the subject matter of their courses than the old calendar, that what was formerly covered in an 18-week semester was now crammed into a 12-week quarter. A poll taken by the late Thelma Carder in October of 1973 showed 29 instructors were dissatisfied with the quarter calendar, with only 14 satisfied—a margin of 2 to 1 (67% to 33%). However, while many students were also opposed to the new calendar, a poll of students in the same period revealed that 151 students preferred the quarter calendar, compared to 110 who preferred the semester calendar (58% to 42%).[1]

Since these early days of controversy, attempts were made to bring back the semester calendar, led by Miss Carder. Ultimately, former Superintendent/ President, R. William Graham authorized a study of calendars. This study indicated that student interest in the subject was very low. Of 941 students polled (in winter, 1975), nearly half (468 or 47.9%) had no preference at all. In the same poll, 25.7% preferred the quarter, and 12.7% preferred the semester. In raw terms, 242 preferred the quarter, 120 preferred the semester--a margin of 2-1.

No poll was made of the faculty at that time, but informed soundings have indicated that, with the passage of time, the amount and intensity of faculty opposition to the quarter has declined. In short, the calendar issue is no longer "hot."

Has the quarter calendar demonstrated to students and faculty its superiority to the semester calendar? It is hard to say, for as with most issues, time and habit have a way of overcoming initial opposition. If we are to come to an intelligent understanding of the calendar question, we must go beyond student and faculty surveys and examine the issue on its merits. Such an attempt was made by the office of Research and Development (R&D) in 1975 and 1976. The final report of R & D, authored by Kenneth D. Mack, was issued on December 1, 1976.

A number of issues were examined in that report, including the historical background, surveys of student opinion (see above) and of other community colleges, the effect on instructor load of the calendar change, the effect on room utilization, the effect on course completions (see my earlier report of August 23, 1979), the effect on number of course offerings, the effect on number of units and hours per class, and registration and record-keeping costs. The conclusions reached on these issues were highly tentative (and frankly trivial), but one in particular was regarded as critical: the effect on student course completions. Evidently, however interesting the educational and other issues were, the raw data of course completions were given more weight than any other issue. I have examined this issue and have found the evidence to be decidedly ambiguous. That is, while R & D data showed an increase in completion rates from 1970-71 to 1971-72 of nearly 20% (from 68% to 87.95%), my research showed that the figures were not entirely accurate, that truly comparable information on the two years does not exist, that one year for each calendar is an insufficient data base, and that the enrollments reported for 1971-72 were probably not as low as reported. I could not prove

conclusively, however, that completions did not increase with the conversion. Rather, I showed that other information renders the findings of the R & D study less significant than has been believed. That is, I found that overall completion rates in English composition and U.S. history--two high-enrollment, required classes--were fairly close under both calendars, that sequence courses, e.g. History 4ABC, have suffered enrollment declines in the quarter calendar, and that unavoidable inexactness in record keeping in both calendars renders all conclusions drawn from comparisons highly tenuous.

Now, while the R & D report took notice of student opinion about the two calendars, and faithfully reported the arguments made by the Dean of Instruction, Dr. Mel Huden, in favor of the quarter calendar, it did not give any serious consideration to arguments of a non-quantitative nature. All arguments were merely reported as data for analysis, not material for thoughtful consideration. Implicit in the study is the assumption that only factual, empirical, and quantitative data can be the basis for a decision about which calendar is best. Even the earlier report by Thelma Carder is distinguished from the R & D study only by the quantity of reporting on student and faculty opinions. The critical factor in that report was the number arranged on one side or the other.

This report is distinguishable from previous ones on the following ground: We shall consider not only the statistics involved (largely covered in my earlier report) but the evidence and plausibility of reasons for and against the two calendars.

In truth, it takes some doing to construe the calendar issue as a significant educational issue. As reported in College and University (spring, 1977), "There are many new forces which go beyond internal academic needs influencing calendar discussion." This understatement refers to such political bodies as state legislatures and state higher education commissions. The "high interest by outside bodies [is] for very different reasons" than academic,[2] viz., costs, uniformity among colleges and the desire for new markets. This is entirely consistent with what has sparked interest in the quarter calendar in the past. Writing in 1963, Davis McEntire observed, "The current impetus to year-round operation [i.e., quarter calendar] comes mainly from the prospect of extremely large increases in enrollments during the next decade and beyond, combined with the difficulty of obtaining financial means sufficient to provide necessary expansion of physical facilities."[3] Thus, while colleges in the early 60s wished to find a way to accommodate more students and generate more income, colleges today seek to hold on to enrollments or to decrease the drop-out rate.[4] Critical for the solutions of both problems is an effective calendar.

But while the utility of one or another calendar for enrollment purposes is regarded as very important, actually, most of the public argument made on behalf of calendars has been made in terms of the educational issues. For example, Mel Huden provided eleven such reasons in a news release issued in fall, 1970. More specifically, the reasons given were designed to simplify or facilitate the education of students. (See Section IV below, pages 10-16.)

Could the non-educational reasons for calendar conversion simply be too complicated or irrelevant to most students? Is the listing of educational arguments merely pro forma? Is it merely habitual or only an afterthought? One

would think that the serious consideration of educational issues would be uppermost in the minds of educators as they considered the calendar issue. It is with the intention of taking the educational (as well as non-educational) arguments seriously that this report is issued to the campus community.

This report will be divided into four parts. First, we will examine a number of general considerations connected with academic calendars. Second, we will consider the intended effects of the quarter calendar. Third, we shall take up the issue of cost-effectiveness. Finally, we will consider the advantages and disadvantages of the semester and quarter calendars.

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Initially, we must put the issue of which calendar is best for Barstow College into the proper perspective. Directly put, the purposes of an educational institution are of greater importance than any particular means by which an institution may seek to achieve them. An academic calendar, then, is only a means to an end, not an end in itself. The questions concerning, e.g., whether we are an academic or vocational institution, whether we are demanding or lax in our expectations, what sort of curriculum we have, how much more we should be guided by educational principles than by non-educational ones, and so on, are issues of much greater significance than the calendar we use. In short, our primary mission is educational; the time frame in which we educate is a secondary, albeit important, issue.

However this may be, there is little question that the choice of calendar and how a calendar is utilized, may have great impact on <u>how well</u> or even <u>whether</u> the educational institution achieves its objectives. Thus, if the relatively shorter quarter calendar deprives students of enough time to study, this effect can and should be considered from an educational standpoint. And these factors may indeed loom large at an institution such as ours, which has virtually no control over the number or quality of its students. That is, a largely unprepared student body needs all the assistance it can get in attaining educational objectives.

Secondly, the basis for deciding which calendar to use should not be primarily financial. Colleges are non-profit institutions, not only because our laws require them to be, but because many educators have known that too great an emphasis on financial issues would have the effect of distorting collegiate priorities. They feared that the delicate task of educating students well could easily become sacrificed to the desire to make money. Now the United States of America is a commercial republic. As Calvin Coolidge once observed, "The business of America is business." President Coolidge went on to stress how and why the pursuit of property and profit should be subordinated to the development of higher things, including (especially) education. However, his words have often gone unheeded because of the predominance in this country of the acquisitive passion. Of course, the bills cannot be paid with anything but money, and students, whose primary end is knowledge, are indispensable to obtaining the money. But as McEntire pointed out, "The essential problem of educational policy is to select that combination of [calendar] features which will minimize risks to quality while enabling the educational institution to serve more students."[5]

Thirdly, we must take note of the fact that most colleges and universities in both California and the United States—after a period during the 60s and 70s when the movement for a quarter calendar was very strong--have opted to retain, return to or modify a semester calendar. According to the Chronicle of Higher Education (January 16, 1978), the majority of colleges have some form or another of the semester calendar. Of 2,422 colleges surveyed, 1,332 (55%) used the semester calendar, 581 (22.4%) used the quarter calendar, and 315 (13%) used the 4-1-4 calendar. The overwhelming majority (1,163--or 87%) of colleges using the semester calendar are on the early semester variant. This means that 48% of all colleges surveyed use the early semester calendar (August to December, January to May).[6]

Turning to California, my own survey (based upon catalogues available at the Barstow College Library) shows that the semester is used by 97 of 145 colleges (66.9%), while only 36 (24.8%) use the quarter. These quarter calendar percentages are very close to the national figures above, while the semester percentages are over 11 points higher. Among community colleges in California, the semester calendar is even more popular. Sixty-two of 74 colleges surveyed (83.8%) use the semester calendar, while only 11 (14.9%) operate on the quarter calendar. (See Appendix A)

Another perspective comes from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges which reported in May, 1979, that the number of colleges in the western states using the semester increased from 87 to 94 (8%) from 1977-78 to 1978-79. By contrast, only 15 colleges used the quarter calendar both years. Of 117 western colleges surveyed in 1978-79, then, 80.7% are on the semester and 12.8% use the quarter calendar.

Fourthly, there are indications that the quarter calendar (that is, the division of calendar into four parts) was originally stimulated by the summer school movement, which never got off the ground. According to J. R. Davis, writing in the Journal of Higher Education (February 1979), "It is difficult to say precisely when the quarter system began as a year-round calendar, but its genesis is found in the summer school movement."[7] That is, it is with the intention of generating something approaching fulltime enrollment during the summer months that the movement toward a quarter calendar began. However, James Horin noted in College and University (Summer, 1979) that summer enrollment is only about one-third of other terms.[8] Problems of staff availability and low student interest have hampered the project of year-round education. At Barstow College, the disparity is even greater. The average number of final enrollments for 20 quarters (excluding summer) between fall, 1979 and fall, 1978 was 3419, while the average for seven summer quarters between 1971 and 1977 was 396. Summer enrollments at Barstow College are only about one-twelfth of what they are during the other quarters. (See Appendix B.) The origins of the quarter calendar, not surprisingly, have been largely forgotten. Yet the question concerning the merits of the quarter calendar was once linked with the drive for a year-round operation that has never really materialized.

II. INTENDED EFFECTS OF THE QUARTER CALENDAR

"The most important criteria to use in selecting from among the many [calendar]

options currently available are those that relate to the desired teaching-learning process, not the external and arbitrary criteria of convenience or conformity." [9]

As noted in the Introduction of this paper, the primary public arguments made on behalf of the quarter calendar at this college were educational ones. For example, Dr. Huden argued that "students have more opportunity for electives, shifts of major interest, and academic exploration." Presumably, such advantages were related to a "desired teaching-learning process." It might reasonably be asked, what is the effect of the change from the semester to quarter calendar on this process? The most complete answer to this question has been provided by the experience of Chabot College in Hayward, the first community college to move to the quarter calendar, in 1966-67. Writing in the Junior College Journal, Barbara Mertes observed, "The main principle of a conversion was based on the predicted educational benefits to students."[10]

The researcher took advantage of the major opportunity to study the effects of the calendar conversion by an in-depth survey of 233 full-time students with 12 or more units (173 transfer, 60 two-year preoccupational) who attended Chabot for one year under each calendar. The purpose of the study was two-fold: (1) to identify the students' attitudes toward their educational experiences, and (2) to determine the relationship between their attitudes and their academic achievements.[11] Now while the students responded 2-1 in favor of the quarter system, the researcher concluded: "The students' preference for the quarter system was based upon their idealization of a quarter system and not of what they were actually experiencing." In other words, the students' preference for the quarter calendar was "highly qualified." Below are the four qualifications:

1. Students were not especially concerned with the terms quarter or semester. They viewed these terms as abstractions, and had little meaning for them. Students were concerned with the specific experiences that they would encounter under one or the other system.

2. There is nearly a unanimous feeling among students that the quarter system places them in an environment that involves considerable pressure accompanied by a feeling of being rushed and hurried in comparison to their experiences under the semester system. Students emphasize repeatedly that every attempt should be made to reduce the number of courses a student takes under the quarter system, and thus permit an opportunity to perform in-depth exploration and study the course.

3. A significant number of students reported that under the quarter system, as compared with the semester system, the following problems are more prevalent for the student: (a) less time for the adequate use of the library, (b) less faculty contact, (c) increased problems with registration procedures, (d) increased difficulty in arranging counseling appointments, and (e) a decreasing opportunity to take elective courses.

4. Students pointed out that in their view the academically oriented transfer student succeeds better under the quarter system, while the poor academic student, and the student in the 2-year pre-occupational program, appear to have more problems with success under the quarter system.[12]

No comparable studies have been done at Barstow College. However, we know from recent figures provided for us by researchers at California State College, Sacramento, that less than 30 of our students last year transferred to a public 4-year school in California (see Appendix C). And, according to Arthur Cohen, Director of ERIC, a research organization for community colleges, only four percent of community college students in California transferred to four-year schools in 1977.[13]

Whether or not so few students transfer from Barstow College because of the educational difficuties imposed by an inappropriate calendar, we shall leave to one side. Let it suffice to say that the large number of non-transfer students at this college may benefit more from the calendar system that gives them more time to study and learn the material in their courses than from a calendar system which affords them less time for these purposes. But, it must be conceded, there is an assumption made by the students (and the researcher) in the Chabot study, and by this researcher as well, that, other things being equal, more time to study is better than less. In a memo to the college staff in January, 1978, Robert Chamberlin, Dean of Students conceded, however reluctantly, that "students are not getting the subject-matter depth in a quarter that they got in the semester." He added: "they also get more in a month than they get in a week, under normal conditions." But are these assertions, however they may be understood by those who make them, true? There are a number of issues here which must be sorted out and discussed. Moreover, there are several terms that need to be understood clearly. Who are "students?" What is subject matter?" What constitutes "depth?" What does it mean to "get more?"

Those who maintain that students learn more under the semester calendar than under the quarter do not, I believe, understand subject matter or breadth or depth of same simply in quantitative terms. That is, the issue is not which calendar provides more time to learn more information. Obviously, as Dean Chamberlin seems to concede, the semester calendar, which is 16-18 weeks long compared to the 11-or 12-week quarter calendar, would win that contest hands down. We have all discovered that a semester's worth of material is very difficult to compress into a quarter, even though classes technically meet the same number of hours. While there may be 44-48 hours spent in class under both calendars, each hour added during each week to the shorter calendar is one hour taken away from study time. This is particularly true in light of the fact that Barstow College chose not to adopt a scheduling system which took this matter into consideration. That is, whereas, for example, California State College, San Bernardino established 12 hours as a normal load in a schedule characterized by four-hour-a-week classes;[14] and others, particularly Kalamazoo College in Michigan, provide for a 3-3-3 system in which "the student typically takes three subjects rather than the usual five or six";[15] Barstow College has established a <u>normal</u> load of 16 units, with the students given the freedom to take up to 19 without official authorization.

We do not, then, for all practical purposes, attach any educational significance to the differences between the semester and quarter calendars. We do

not--offically, at least--encourage students to adjust their class loads in accordance with our relatively short and intensive time frame. We are more concerned, as Dean Chamberlin has correctly implied, about "whether students attend better" than whether they "learn better."

The issue goes deeper, however. Is learning simply a matter of adjusting to time frames? Is there more to learning than such things (important as they are) as information-gathering, memory work, completion of assignments, passing scores and the like? Or is it also a matter of insight and reflection? Is all knowledge merely perceptual, i.e., data, or is it also conceptual, i.e., theories and generalizations? Obviously, it is both, but the distinction can easily be blurred in an overly intense, hurried, busy atmosphere. What is much more common, and less intellectually demanding, is simply memorizing the concepts right along with the data.

For example, that the American Revolution was caused, at least in part, by determined British efforts to regulate colonial trade and commerce (or, at least, more closely than prior to the French and Indian War), is attested to by many, if not all, historians and political scientists who have studied the issue. Accordingly, thousands of instructors teach this generalization to millions of students who rarely question it. But the truth of it depends upon at least two things: enough convincing and pertinent facts to support it and some major premise--itself based upon a relevant political principle--in the light of which the generalization (a minor premise) leads to the appropriate conclusion. Thus, if students are truly to know that the interpretation of the historical event in question is accurate, they need to study the facts and the more comprehensive generalization which supports it. Such a generalization might well be the following: any attempt to regulate closely a largely self-governing people from the outside will lead to revolution. But this generalization depends upon others, the most important of which is the major premise of the Declaration of Independence, viz., that all men are created equal.

It would certainly be easy enough for an instructor to assert the truth of his generalizations and for students to accept them. But, again, if the student wishes to know what the truth is about this great event in American history, he must have enough time for reflection on it.

This takes us to the heart of the matter. What is a student? In a conventional sense, a student is anyone who is enrolled in a educational institution or program. Besides this stipulative definition, however, Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines a student as, "One who studies, an attentive and systematic observer." In other words, a student is defined not simply by his conventional status, i.e., his enrollment in school, but by what he does and, ultimately, by what he is. A person who does not study, then, is not a student. A person who is not attentive and systematic in his observations is no student, whether he is enrolled in a school or college or not.

By the same reasoning, an educational institution more or less facilitates or hinders study in the strict sense of the word according to how that institution's purposes, policies, procedures, organizational structures, calendars and so on enable students to do their work well. In the first place, then, the more time available to study, the better. (Presumably,

such an awareness is the premise for the current popularity of life-long learning.)[16] Why? Because the more time a student has to think to collect his thoughts attentively and systematically, the more likely it is that he will understand what he is studying.

Let us return to our example from the American Revolution. While a student may be made to see, by effective instruction, the connection between the facts in the historical situation and the generalization made on the basis of those facts, he has not necessarily, by virtue of that instruction, had the experience of thinking the issue through for himself. In a word, he is taking it on the instructor's authority. While he could do worse than to trust his instructor, the instructor might be wrong. How is a student to know whether his teaching is sound or not unless he is given at least a portion of the time required by scholars (and others, such as statesmen) to come to his own conclusions?

Next we must consider the instructor. Is he a student or not? According to the conventional definition, he is not. But, of course, he was required to submit to the discipline of a student before he was permitted to teach. And, of course, if he is to continue teaching with some success, he must, as we often say, "keep up with his field." That means, of course, that he must continue to study; he must continue the life of a student himself. Now while teachers have summers (and an occasional sabbatical) in which they may study, surely, to be good teachers, they must also study their material right along with their students. If they are to correct, revise, update, clarify and improve their courses, they must remain students. In short, the additional six weeks provided by the semester system helps teachers to study as well as their pupils.[17]

In summary, the advantage of the additional time of the semester system consists in the opportunity for students and teachers to learn and think about the subject matter of their courses. What are said to be educational benefits to students of the quarter calendar are actually symptomatic of a serious misreading of our situation. What our students need is not so much variety in their courses as a clear and accurate diagnosis of their learning abilities and a prescription based upon that diagnosis. (See below p. 13, Nos. 3, 4)

III. COST EFFECTIVENESS

Whatever harmful effects the quarter calendar may have upon the learning opportunities of our students, it is maintained by supporters of the quarter calendar that the calendar they favor is more cost effective than the semester calendar. This arises from the belief that the shorter attendance period of the quarter tends to increase student retention. We do not mean retention of what has been learned, but retention of students in their classes. We will examine the truth of this assertion below. But first, let us consider the assumption behind the preference for the quarter calendar: Our students have a short attention span. They don't have the qualities required to stay longer than their interest may incline them. Clearly, the supporters of the quarter calendar are not distinguished from their opponents by their high opinion of our students. Rather, the issue is, what is the best approach to take in light of the situation? That is, is it good to respond to our students' short attention span by institutionalizing it in

our calendar plan? Or does it make more sense to widen that span through the calendar plan that requires more attention for longer than they are inclined to give? Like archers, we can reach the target only if we aim high--farther than we are inclined. When we aim low, we not only miss the target but may even fail to reach its general vicinity.

The basis for the claim of cost effectiveness for the quarter over the semester is, as we have said, the allegedly higher retention rate of the former. That is, a greater percentage of students complete the quarter than complete the semester. But while the figures of the R & D study of 1976 seem to support this (88%, 1971, quarter vs. 68%, 1970, semester), it leaves out of consideration a number of points. First, the college had a much greater capability for gathering data on completion rates beginning in 1971 because of the adoption of the new data processing system. The enrollment figures that once had to be totalled by hand now could be obtained very quickly by the computer. Specifically, whereas completion rates (and grade distribution) once had to be determined by going through each class grading list, since 1971 we have had the advantage of our own data processing system which can calculate these rates for each instructor or department. All that is left, then, is to total all completion figures and then calculate the rate.

What this means is that the figures for comparison between 1970-71 and 1971-72 are not really very comparable. There is no reason to doubt the honesty of the R & D researchers to realize that generalizations based upon the comparison of data from two quite different reporting systems are questionable.

It has also been maintained that the switch to the quarter calendar generated more enrollment than under the semester calendar. But an analysis of Average Daily Attendance figures for the years of the transition does not bear this out. (See Appendix D.) In 1971-72, the first year of the quarter calendar, the ADA increased by nearly 23 (3.2%), the lowest increase since 1965-66. In fact, steady, rather than spectacular, growth occurred between 1968-69 and 1973-74. It was not until 1974-75, when Barstow College had a new Superintendent/President and the full effects of veterans' educational benefits were being felt (now that the direct American involvement in Vietnam was over), that the college experienced significant growth. Growth rates of 4.2% and 6.5% in 1972-73 and 1973-74 were followed by growth in 1974-75 and 1975-76 that had not been seen since 1966-67 and 1967-68 when the Vietnam War was at its peak. ADA grew in the mid-seventies by percentages of 18.6 and 11.6, compared to 21.3 and 30.1 in the mid-sixties. And for the last four years at Barstow College, ADA has actually declined from a high of 1,110 in 1975-76 to 951 in 1978-79.

It is true that enrollment generally has been higher in the 1970s than the 1960s, but it is quite possible that this would have been the case without the quarter calendar. The 1960s were the first few years of a new institution; it is not surprising that its student population should be less in its first than in its second decade, when the school was firmly established. In other words, we should not make the mistake of assigning to one particular variable, however important, a weight out of all proportion to its significance and which neglects the other variables of equal or greater importance. It takes some straining to look at the steady rate of growth for this college and assign to one variable the credit for the continuation or increase in the rate of that growth.

But even if the quarter calendar were a significant element in accounting for the growth of Barstow College, we know that it came with a price, non-monetary as well as monetary. The college must pay the cost of registering students, not twice, but three times, a year. According to the 1976 R & D report, "An increase of $10,000 is estimated for 2,000 students, with an additional registration caused by the quarter calendar."[18] Additional classified staff and work-study employees have been required to process the additional paperwork.

Consider also the non-monetary costs (which may have indirect monetary consequences). Students who attend Barstow College may register as many as three times, not merely twice, a year. One does not have to be a researcher or statistician to know that registration takes time, involves difficulties, produces frustration and may even antagonize a student to the point he may "beat the system" by dropping out of it. As we cater to our students' short attention span by shortening the length of our course terms, we may be simultaneously losing their cooperation by forcing them to register 50% more than they did in the semester calendar. Too, it was conceded by partisans of the quarter calendar that the shorter term gives students "three chances per year" for failure, as well as success. Add to this the greater number of courses which a student may take throughout his time at Barstow College, and you may well have the recipe for widespread academic failure. But if this seems unlikely (or even untrue), remember the supporters of the quarter calendar assumed that many students' attention spans were too short for their completion of the 18-week semester. Besides, how can a student whose attention span is too short to study for a semester have a broad enough range of interest to encompass more subjects in a shorter period of time? It is implausible to assert that a short attention span can be corrected by attention on more subjects. Assuming a normal load of 15 units in the semester, and 16 units in the quarter calendar, students take two more courses and spend 35 more hours in the classroom per year in the latter than in the former.

This brings us to the indirect costs. Each time a student registers for courses, he must buy books. Assuming an average of $10-15 dollars per course, students spend $20-30 dollars more per year on books than previously. And if they attend for more hours, they may spend more on the increasingly precious gasoline to get to campus.

Could these indirect costs help to explain why more and more of our enrollment is part-time rather than full-time? Could a similar explanation account for the students' desire for a four-day week?

In summary, the increased revenues and, therefore, the cost effectiveness of the quarter calendar are difficult to pinpoint and are not borne out by increased enrollment. Meanwhile, the college must absorb approximately $10,000 in increased costs for the extra registration period and the students must absorb an increase in costs for extra books and transportation.[19]

IV. ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF SEMESTER AND QUARTER CALENDARS

The final part of this paper is a consideration of a variety of matters bearing on the relative merits of the two calendars which have been previously

treated in purely statistical or merely rhetorical fashion. That is, surveys have been taken to show how students and faculty feel about each calendar; and friends of each calendar have stated reasons for their preferences; but no systematic or, frankly, serious effort has been made to ascertain the truth of these claims. In this section, we shall set forth a sort of balance sheet of the advantages and disadvantages of each calendar which, when completed, may be "totaled up" to find out where most of the advantages lie. In doing so, we must distinguish between educational and non-educational reasons, and between reasons of greater or lesser significance. For example, a claim for a high retention rate is a non-educational reason, while a claim that students learn better in a short term is an educational one. And a high retention rate is more important than how many conflicts are caused by holidays.

Our procedure will be to consider the advantages and disadvantages of the quarter and semester calendars through a careful examination of Mel Hayden's news release of fall, 1970, which summarized all the arguments for the quarter calendar and, implicitly, against the semester calendar. Eleven reasons were there advanced for conversion to the quarter calendar. What follows is a statement of each of these reasons and analysis of their validity.

1. There would be better articulation with the University of California and state colleges and universities. While it is true that all nine campuses of the University of California are on the quarter calendar, only seven of 16 of the state colleges and universities are.

   Moreover, it has not seemed to have helped our students with articulation, or at least has not encouraged them to transfer. Recent figures supplied by California State College, Sacramento reveal that allegedly better articulation with public four-year schools has not succeeded in increasing the number of students transferring from Barstow College beyond approximately 25-30 per year. (As far as community colleges are concerned, eleven colleges had adopted the quarter calendar by 1971-72, but none has done so since that time.)

2. Students would have more opportunities for electives, shifts of major interest and academic exploration. Assuming that such opportunities are desirable, we must ask, are more classes possible for students under the quarter calendar than under the semester calendar? The answer to this question appears to be "yes," if the growing size of the Barstow College catalog is any indication. In 1970-71, the last year of the semester calendar, there were 301 course descriptions distributed over 58 pages in a 106-page catalog. By 1979-80, there were 620 course descriptions over 136 pages in a 201-page catalog. Thus, the number of courses has increased by 106%, the numbers of pages in which these course descriptions are contained by 134.5%, and the number of pages in the catalog by 69.9%. While this course proliferation was undoubtedly of some value during the mid-1970s when the enrollment in terms of average daily attendance shot up over 1000, in this era of declining enrollments such proliferation has outlived its usefulness. Indeed, that was the judgment of the Accrediting

Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges in its report of June 22, 1979.

> The College should continue to review its catalogue, curriculum and schedule to ensure clients [students] when (or if) courses are offered, and in which quarter if possible. Those that are not in reality offered during the course of a reasonable period of time, say a two-year period, should be eliminated from the lists. There was some feeling that the catalogue exaggerates the actually available courses, and in this sense may be deceptive.[20] (Emphasis added.)

Let us consider one more aspect of the "greater variety of courses" issue. I think it can be shown that such variety is not merely desirable in a quarter calendar; in fact, it is a necessity. I say this because, as noted above, we have not followed the example of other schools, such as Cal State, San Bernardino, which converted to the quarter calendar and established the average student load at twelve hours. Necessarily, then, the number of courses must increase to support normal student loads of 16 to 19, as recommended by our catalog.

> The minimum average unit load for a full-time student intending to complete an A.A. or and A.S. degree program in six quarters is 15 units plus P.E. activity courses...Any load over 19 units for a quarter requires counselor approval.[21]

This means that the demand for courses which were once offered over one or two semesters is liable to be largely exhausted in one or two quarters (one possible cause of our relatively light spring quarter enrollment); or if a two-semester course is spread over three quarters, enrollment in many cases drops by the third course in the sequence.[22] If the enrollment continually expands, then the additional term can, as befits the plan of its designers, accommodate the extra enrollment in the extra term. But if class size limits are not established and enforced, that is, if enrollments are particularly high in the first two terms, the demand may (and does) shrink by the third term. How to solve this problem? Offer more courses, and this we have done on a rather large scale.

Since the peak enrollment year of 1975-76 (ADA: 1,110), our ADA has fallen to 951 as of 1978-79--a drop of 159 ADA or 14.3%. The era of continually expanding enrollments (which we have experienced since the beginning of the college) appears to be over, at least for the time being. But the growth of our courses has continued while average daily attendance has declined. Also relevant are the total enrollments during this period of decline. They have fallen from an estimated[23] 12,703 (total) and 10,881 (final) in 1975-76 to 11,653 and 9,674 in 1978-79. Thus, total enrollments have declined 8.3% and final enrollments by 11.1%. Statistically, the course proliferation required by the quarter calendar seems no longer to be justified. This, in turn, raises questions about the wisdom of keeping a calendar system which made the course proliferation desirable (as well as necessary).

3. Students get three chances a year for academic success (or failure). The meaning of this claim seems to be that if a student does poorly in one or more courses, he or she has one more opportunity than the semester calendar affords, to make up the deficiency. This would have to be a rather leisurely student, in no hurry to complete the requirements for the A.A. or A.S. degree or for transferring to a four-year school. However, if our students wish not to delay their academic progress, they would have to take one or more classes in addition to their full load the following quarter to make up the deficiency. It should be noted that if more terms mean more possibilities for academic failure, then more deficiencies may have to be made up over six terms than over four. Summer school would serve a vital function in this respect, although there is very little evidence that it has been used specifically for the purpose of making up known student deficiencies.

4. Students can adjust their unit load to match their ability and/or outside job demand. Presumably, with an additional academic term, students are able to carry unit loads of different amounts in different quarters as their jobs demand or abilities require. But, again, given the requirements of completing a two-year program, going light in units in one quarter will prove quite costly in terms of the need for heavy unit loads in subsequent quarters. The effect is that students take longer to complete their program (or perhaps lose interest and abandon the idea).

   But we should also note that there is no reason why such shifts as mentioned above (no. 3) cannot occur in the semester calendar. The most effective device that permits students to make up light loads is a summer program, which can be offered under either calendar.

5. The quarter system removes the "drudgery" of a long 18-week semester and eliminates the "float period." It is particularly adaptable for evening students. This claim raises a number of questions. Is there any more drudgery in 18 weeks than in 12? Are there no advantages in longer periods of study? Can the evening students be accommodated in the semester calendar?

   There is, initially, the question of drudgery. Apparently, the semester is seen as "too long." Certainly this is a matter of opinion. Here we confront the problem of the students' short attention spans and the "float period" with which that problem is connected. We have already discussed the advantages of a relatively leisurely study period in Section II, so that we need not repeat it here. Let it suffice to say that the clear implication of the view that our students are quickly bored with their courses is that they are not yet prepared for serious study. But we may counter this view with the observation that designing an academic calendar to accommodate the less serious student tends to guarantee a large and continuing supply of such students. But if such "drudgery" and "floating" is a problem for some of our students, then there is no reason why we cannot incorporate 6, 9, or 12 week courses in an 18-week semester.

Whether a course of study constitutes drudgery is a function of one's state of mind. A 12-week course can be as much drudgery as an 18-week course if the student's attitude is negative, if the instructor is poor, if the physical conditions are unfavorable, etc. The question is not which calendar offers the most opportunity for drudgery, but rather which calendar offers the most advantages for the achievement of human potential--surely a slow, uneven and precarious process for the sake of an elusive and difficult goal?

Next, the advantage of the longer semester term is that it gives students an opportunity for depth, as well as breadth, in their courses. That is, they are not forced to cover many topics rather superficially or a very few topics in depth (the two major ways in which instructors have adapted their courses to the quarter calendar), but have the opportunity to cover several topics in depth.

Finally, if the evening students require a shorter time to complete courses, we can accommodate them with shorter courses, as noted above.

6. The quarter calendar enforces greater contact between students and counselors, and students and teachers. This has not happened. Although the reasons for this are more complicated than the choice of calendar, it is widely known that student contact with counselors and teachers here is very low. Students spend less time on campus than they used to, and they have very little contact with instructors outside the classroom, while they tend to avoid seeing the counselors more than once or twice during their time here. I submit that the short term of the quarter calendar does not help for the simple reason that students spend less time in their classes than they used to. If they take more than one course from an instructor, and thus get to know that instructor better, it usually means they are not taking much advantage of the opportunity for taking a variety of courses in the college program, another promised advantage of the quarter calendar.

7. There may be fewer courses per student which can mean fewer program changes and record transitions in any one quarter. In other words, given the shortening of the term by 1/3, students are less likely to change their programs. But students do change their programs, and if they do take fewer courses, they must necessarily take longer to finish their degree or certificate programs. (In a recent study, I found that the average quarter load here is 7-8 units.)

8. There are increased entry and exit points for a student. This is a virtual restatement of the claims for greater opportunity and variety, and for more chances for success (or failure) discussed previously, so that we need add nothing here. But we should point out that if students have more chances to drop courses (or one's entire enrollment) the more chances they have to leave the college's programs altogether. While it is true that shorter terms allow students to move in and out of college with less difficulty than with longer terms, it is also true that the more courses they

take, the harder it is to complete them all; if they adjust their load downward, they may take more time to complete their studies anyway.

9. The quarter calendar fits the natural division of the year (Christmas and Easter breaks) more efficiently. The quarter calendar does indeed allow the students and instructors to finish the fall term before Christmas, and to take a spring break between winter and spring quarters, but they must pay several times for this. They must finish the academic year at least three weeks to a month later than schools on the semester calendar, even though Barstow College starts no later, in most cases. Those who have children must give up the spring vacation that coincides with the Easter vacation granted at the K-12 level (although Good Friday is a holiday at Barstow College). And they must give up the Easter vacation the College once had in addition to the semester break in late January.

   Now if the Christmas vacation is an intolerable break in the fall semester (which has not enticed the K-12 system to make a change), we could adopt an early semester, which begins in August, breaks in Christmas, and ends in May. This would gain the college more of the vacational advantages of both calendars than either one singly can provide. That is, the vacations would coincide with the K-12 schools, and students and instructors would get out earlier in the year. The only price paid for this is the loss of a semester break separate from Easter or Christmas vacations.

   One further point. The holidays are a useful time for students to give full attention to lengthy outside assignments such as term papers, book reports, and the like. How many times did we faculty, as students, complete such assignments during the time when there were no classes or daily or weekly assignments to interfere with our time?

10. The conversion will require total re-examination of the curriculum by the faculty with attention to course content and objectives. The simple response to this claim is that any calendar conversion will have this effect. Thus, if we convert to the semester calendar, we shall, unavoidably, re-examine our curriculum. But more is meant than this, otherwise the argument would be for periodic calendar change in order to promote continual curriculum re-examination. What is really meant is that the faculty is forced to eliminate superfluity from semester-length courses that are regarded as too long. Now what is or is not superfluous is a matter for professional judgment. But given a calendar which habituates students to moving through their courses quickly, it is not hard to see how the pressure would build up on instructors to simplify their courses so that their students would not be greatly delayed in their quest for a degree or certificate or in their plans to transfer to a four-year school. The comments most often heard from students about the quarter calendar are either that the courses move too fast or there is little of substance to them. For this reason, advocates of the quarter wanted to avoid the

problems noted by such calendar-converting colleges as Chabot.[24] But they may have given rise to a different problem entirely, if their low view of the student's attention span is any indication. And we have noted that a significant effect of the conversion of the quarter calendar is course proliferation, which I submit does not amount to the same thing as a re-examination of the curriculum.

11. The week between quarters allows more time for the registrar to process records. However, in the last year of the semester calendar, (1970-71), there was a full week between the last final examination in the fall and the first day of classes in the spring (January 23-February 1). Perhaps what is meant is that employees in Student Personnel (not to mention other departments of the college) could utilize the extra week between quarters for processing records. But this advantage is eliminated by the absence of the separate Easter vacation. There is no net gain in work time in the quarter calendar. And the same negligible advantage could be obtained under the early semester calendar in which the fall term ends in December.

Taken together, we find these eleven arguments for the quarter calendar unconvincing and certainly uncompelling. The so-called advantages of the quarter calendar come at the price of numerous disadvantages or the loss of advantages of the semester calendar. Here is a summary: The quarter calendar has not become the predominant one in California higher education; it has facilitated, even required, proliferation of courses, but this variety comes at the price of slower student progress, and it has outlived its usefulness in this era of declining enrollments; similarly, the fact that students have "three chances" instead of two for success or failure means in practice that students with deficiencies will have heavy loads more often or take longer to obtain their degrees, while the value of downward load adjustments for working students or those with deficiencies must be balanced against the inevitable delay in student progress; the attempt to reduce the alleged drudgery of the semester calendar constitutes a counterproductive accommodation to the less serious students, while at the same time giving them no particular advantages; even so, the semester calendar is flexible enough to include short courses for students needing them; student contact with instructors and counselors has probably not increased under the quarter calendar, and has not been helped by the relatively short 12-week contact period; the coincidence of the quarter calendar with traditional holidays comes at the price of a late finish in June and a loss of an Easter vacation coinciding with the K-12 system, and the early semester plan overcomes all these objections; the hope for a change in course objectives, content, and length with a transition to the quarter has either not come about, has deprived the students of educational substance, or has simply led to course proliferation; and the promised extra week for processing student work has turned out to be illusory.

CONCLUSION

In this report, we have considered the issues connected with a school calendar. We now recommend that Barstow College convert to the semester calendar, primarily because that calendar is more conducive to effective teaching and learning; secondarily, to save the cost of registration for an additional

term. In the course of consideration, and to support our recommendation, we maintained that it was necessary to give serious attention to the educational arguments concerning calendars, and not just such non-educational arguments as the claim that greater enrollment results from one calendar over another. Indeed we maintained that the educational goals of the college should determine which calendar to use. To that end, we argued that the greater length of the semester calendar gives it an advantage over the quarter calendar. Not merely learning particular facts but also grasping of theories and generalizations are important ends of higher education. A hurried atmosphere and a relatively short term are not conducive to genuine learning. Next, while we conceded that the shorter calendar produces a better student completion rate, we noted that the extra registrative period costs the district and students extra money in terms of record processing for the former and books and transportation for the latter. Finally, we contended that the specific advantages to the quarter system, such as more opportunities to take more courses, are counterbalanced by the longer period which students need to complete the requirements for a degree.

Essentially, the chief objection to the quarter calendar and the best argument for the semester calendar is educational: there is not enough time to cover the subject matter of most college courses adequately in 12 weeks. Secondarily, the quarter calendar generates extra costs which the college should now eliminate. The enrollment at Barstow College has been declining for the last four years. The costs required to sustain the growth required by the quarter calendar are probably not balanced by the gains of higher completion rates, and a greater number and variety of courses. (The course proliferation here has become so widespread that last year's accrediting team criticized the college for it, and also recommended critical study of the continued utility of the quarter calendar.)

One could discuss numerous other questions connected with the choice of academic calendar (such as the effect on instructor loads), but in our judgment, the basic issue is the educational one. In order to provide more of an educational opportunity for our students, we need a calendar in which students and faculty do not feel rushed, one in which they can have the leisure time necessary for learning in a comprehensive manner. The extra six weeks of the semester calendar will not, of course, transform the climate of Barstow College but will make it possible for us to improve the teaching-learning process.

We also recommend that the college consider adopting the early semester plan. Although the traditional semester calendar will coincide very closely with the Barstow Unified School District and will thus enable us to articulate more effectively with the high schools, most of the semester colleges in the nation (and nearly half of <u>all</u> colleges) have found it most practical to begin fall classes in August and end them at Christmas, and to begin spring classes in January and end them in May. This will eliminate the vacation problem with both calendars, and enable our students to get a better start on summer jobs.

But whatever version of the semester calendar the college might adopt, it is important to insure that students and teachers have ample opportunity for academic excellence.

Footnotes

[1]Interestingly, 125 students (48%) agreed that the semester calendar provided more time to study. Thus, 15 students who preferred the quarter calendar admitted that it provided less time than the semester calendar.

[2]"Process of Calendar Conversion." College and University, Vol. 51, p. 725.

[3]McEntire, David, "Academic Year: Nine Months or Twelve?," AAUP (American Association of University Professors) Bulletin, Vol. 49, p. 360.

[4]The relevance of a calendar designed to enable a college to accommodate more students in an era of declining enrollments (as we are experiencing today) will be explored later. (See Part III, pp. 8-10.)

[5]McEntire, p. 363.

[6]"Annual Report Tabulation," Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges. May 30, 1979.

[7]Davis, J. R., "Changing College Calendars." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 43, February, 1972, p. 143.

[8]Oleson, Loyd C., "Year Round Calendar: Pro and Con. "College and University, Vol 47., p. 374. Remarks by James Horis, Pennsylvania State University.

[9]Davis, p. 149.

[10]Mertes, Barbara, "Student Attitudes Toward the Quarter System: Is the Structure of the Academic Year Meaningfully Related to Learning?" Junior College Journal, Vol. 40, Nov. 1969, p. 50.

[11]Mertes, p. 51

[12]Mertes, p. 56.

[13]Cohen, Arthur M., "Counting the Transfer Student," ERIC-Junior College Resource Review, July 1979.

[14]California State College at San Bernardino, Bulletin, 1979-80, p. 19.

[15]Higher Education: Some New Developments, Samuel Baskin, editor. 1965, McGraw-Hill, San Francisco, p. 230.

[16]However, if no attention is given to other educational issues, motives besides educational ones may better explain the current popularity among educators of "lifelong learning."

[17]Here one may observe that while practically all students are or have been pupils, many pupils are not and never have been students in the strict sense.

[18]Kenneth D. Mack, Barstow College Office of Research and Development. "Calendar Study," December 1, 1976. p. 7.

[19]A note of caution is in order, however. At least one institution of higher learning experienced financial difficulties when it made the transition from a quarter to a semester calendar. N. C. Hall, registrar at the University of Alabama, reported: "When the calendar was changed, enrollments dropped dramatically and income followed suit." College and University, Summer, 1972, p. 368. Nevertheless, officials there still felt that the advantages of the semester calendar outlived its disadvantages. But we lack data about the changes made in the number of hours a week in class from one calendar to another.

[20]Daniel G. Walker, Chairman, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, "Summary of the Evaluation Report," June 22, 1979, p. 22.

[21]Barstow College Catalog, 1979-80, pg. 22.

[22]See my report, "Academic Calendars and Student Retention: An Ambiguous Relationship," August 23, pp. 6-8.

[23]These figures are estimates because the school enrollment figures for fall, 1975, and winter, 1976, are not available. The estimates in this report are three times the spring, 1976, enrollments. Also, total enrollments, refer to the figures at the first census; final enrollments, refer to figures at the end of the term.

[24]See Section II above, pp. 5-6.

APPENDIX A

Survey of College
Calendars
in California

ACADEMIC CALENDARS IN USE AT CALIFORNIA COLLEGES*

Table 1 - All Colleges

Calendar	Number	Percent**
Semester***	97	66.9%
Quarter	36	24.8%
4-1-4	7	4.8%
Trimester	3	2.1%
Other	2	1.4%
Totals	145	100.6%

Table 2 - Community Colleges

Calendar	Number	Percent
Semester	62	83.8%
Quarter	11	14.9%
4-1-4	1	1.4%
Totals	74	100.0%

Table 3 - State Colleges

Semester	9	52.9%
Quarter	7	41.2%
4-1-4	1	5.9%
Totals	17	100.0%

Table 4 - University of California

Semester	1	10.0%
Quarter	9	90.0%
Totals	10	100.0%

Table 5 - Private Colleges

Semester	25	56.8%
Quarter	9	20.5%
4-1-4	5	11.4%
Trimester	3	6.8%
Other	2	4.5%
Totals	44	100.0%

*All information obtained from catalogs available at Barstow College Library.
**Percentages rounded off to nearest tenth. Therefore, figures do not always add up to 100%.
***Survey does not distinguish between traditional and "early" semester, i.e., September-January, February-June vs. August-December, January-May.

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES USING THE SEMESTER CALENDAR

1. Antelope Valley
2. Bakersfield
3. Biola
4. Canada
5. Cerritos
6. Chabot
7. College of San Mateo
8. College of the Desert
9. College of the Sequoias
10. College of the Skskiyous
11. Contra Costa
12. Crafton Hills
13. Cuesta
14. Cypress
15. Diablo Valley
16. East Los Angeles
17. El Camino
18. Evergreen
19. Feather River
20. Fresno City
21. Fullerton
22. Glendale
23. Grossmont
24. Hartnell
25. Laney
26. Imperial Valley
27. Lassen
28. Los Angeles City
29. Los Angeles Harbor
30. Los Angeles Trade Tech
31. Los Medanos
32. Mendocino
33. Merced
34. Mira Costa
35. Modesto
36. Monterey Peninsula
37. Mount San Jacinto
38. Norwalk
39. Orange Coast
40. Oxnard
41. Palomar
42. Palo Verde
43. Pasadena City
44. Porterville
45. Reedley
46. Rio Hondo
47. Riverside City
48. Sacramento City
49. San Diego City
50. San Diego Evening
51. San Diego Mesa
52. San Jose City
53. Santa Ana
54. Santa Barbara City
55. Santa Rosa
56. Sierra
57. Skyline
58. Solano
59. Taft
60. Victor Valley
61. West Hills
62. Yuba

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES USING THE QUARTER CALENDAR

1. Barstow
2. College of Alameda
3. College of the Canyons
4. Columbia
5. De Anza
6. Foothill
7. Grove Street
8. Gavilan
9. Los Angeles Southwest
10. Napa
11. Ohlone

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES USING THE 4-1-4 CALENDAR

1. Cabrillo

PRIVATE COLLEGES USING THE SEMESTER CALENDAR

1. California Baptist
2. California Institute of Art
3. California Lutheran
4. California Western
5. Chapman College
6. Citrus Belt Law School
7. Claremont Graduate School
8. Golden Gate University
9. Golden West College
10. Harvey Mudd
11. Holy Names
12. Immaculate Heart
13. Lone Mountain
14. Loyola Marymount
15. Mills
16. Pacific Oaks
17. Pomona College
18. St. Mary's
19. San Francisco Art Institute
20. Santa Barbara Art Institute
21. Scripps College
22. University of Redlands
23. University of San Francisco
24. University of Southern California
25. Western State College of Law

PRIVATE COLLEGES USING THE QUARTER CALENDAR

1. California Institute of Technology
2. Cogswell College
3. Fresno Pacific
4. Loma Linda University
5. Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies
6. Occidental University
7. Southern California School of Optometry
8. Stanford University
9. University of Santa Clara

PRIVATE COLLEGES USING THE 4-1-4 CALENDAR

1. College of Notre Dame
2. Johnston College
3. La Verne College
4. Southern California College
5. Whittier University

PRIVATE COLLEGES USING THE TRIMESTER CALENDAR

1. California Maritime Academy
2. Pepperdine University
3. Woodbury University

OTHER CALENDARS

1. West Coast University - six terms
2. World College West - unclassified

STATE COLLEGES USING SEMESTER CALENDAR

1. Chico
2. Fresno
3. Long Beach
4. Northridge
5. Sacramento
6. San Diego
7. San Jose
8. San Francisco
9. Sonoma

STATE COLLEGES USING QUARTER CALENDAR

1. Arcata (Humboldt)
2. California Polytechnic-Pomona
3. California Polytechnic-San Luis Obispo
4. Bakersfield
5. Hayward
6. Los Angeles
7. San Bernardino

STATE COLLEGES USING 4-1-4 CALENDAR

1. Stanislaus

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CAMPUSES USING SEMESTER CALENDAR

1. Davis (School of Law)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CAMPUSES USING QUARTER CALENDAR

1. Berkeley
2. Davis (excluding School of Law)
3. Irvine
4. Los Angeles
5. Riverside
6. San Diego
7. San Francisco
8. Santa Barbara
9. Santa Cruz

APPENDIX B

Barstow College

Summer Enrollments

1970-79

APPENDIX B

FINAL ENROLLMENTS IN CLASSES AT BARSTOW COLLEGE, 1971-79
(Summer Sessions Only)
By Richard Reeb

Term	Total Enrollments	Final Enrollments
Summer, 1971	385	326
Summer, 1972	639	494
Summer, 1973	444	416
Summer, 1974	416	314
Summer, 1975	721	571
Summer, 1976	422	385
Summer, 1977	304	268
Totals	3331	2774
Summer, 1978	Not Available	
Summer, 1979	" "	
Average	475.86	396.28

APPENDIX C

Barstow College

Transfer Students,

Fall, 1978

COMMUNITY COLLEGE	BERKELEY	DAVIS	IRVINE	LOS ANGELES	RIVERSIDE	SAN DIEGO	SAN FRANCISCO	SANTA BARBARA	SANTA CRUZ	TOTAL
ALAMEDA	39	9							3	53
AMERICAN RIVER	24	93	4	11	2	2		26		162
ANTELOPE VALLEY	1	2		9	1	1		10	1	25
BAKERSFIELD	6	10	6	6	1	1		15		45
BARSTOW			1	2	3			1		7

[1]Compiled from: University of California Systemwide Corporate Systems, University of California New General Campus Undergraduates Entering from California Community Colleges by California Community College, Fall 1978, Report BD-206, March 30, 1979

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

Office of Admissions, Records and School and College Relations

TABLE 9

UNDERGRADUATE TRANSFERS FROM CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
FALL 1978

COMMUNITY COLLEGE	BAK	CHI	C H	FRE	FUL	HAY	HUM	L B	L A	NOR	POM	SAC	S B	S D	CAL	S F	S J	SLO	SON	STA	ALL CAMPUSES
ALAMEDA, COLLEGE OF	-	7	-	-	1	65	1	5	-	2	-	5	-	2	-	45	9	-	2	-	145
AMERICAN RIVER	3	50	1	14	2	3	21	10	1	3	4	698	1	24	-	17	29	30	4	1	851
ANTELOPE VALLEY	6	6	2	3	1	-	2	14	3	53	5	1	1	18	-	1	9	13	3	2	141
BAKERSFIELD	241	24	-	58	3	4	3	8	1	11	3	11	-	19	-	3	14	37	2	-	442
BARSTOW	-	-	-	1	6	1	1	4	7	3	4	1	5	1	-	-	1	2	3	-	40

NOTE: This report was excerpted from the 1978-79 Statistical Report, Number B - Origin of 1978 Fall Term Enrollment, Division of Institutional Research, Office of the Chancellor, The California State University and Colleges, July 1979.

COMPLIMENTS OF
OFFICE OF SCHOOL/COLLEGE RELATIONS
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

APPENDIX D

Barstow College
Average Daily
Attendance,
1960-79

Appendix D

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE FIGURES FOR BARSTOW COLLEGE, 1960-1979

By Richard Reeb

	Year	ADA	Defined Adult	Deviation	Percentage
SEMESTER	1960-61	277.40	53.31		
	1961-62	343.00	174.17	65.6	23.6%
	1962-63	329.29	152.01	-13.76	-4.0%
	1963-64	370.52	172.39	41.23	12.5%
	1964-65	376.34	120.74	5.82	1.6%
	1965-66	370.04	110.03	-6.30	-1.7%
	1966-67	448.79	109.43	78.75	21.3%
	1967-68	583.91	158.10	135.12	30.1%
	1968-69	615.00	99.00	31.09	5.3%
	1969-70	656.03	146.93	41.03	6.7%
	1970-71	706.32	149.68	50.29	7.7%
QUARTER	1971-72	729.03	132.82	22.71	3.2%
	1972-73	759.98	166.55	30.95	4.2%
	1973-74	809.30	133.69	49.32	6.5%
	1974-75	995.36	173.46	185.06	18.6%
	1975-76	1110.47	207.69*	115.11	11.6%
	1976-77	1083.24		-27.47	-2.5%
	1977-78	1014.72		-68.52	-6.3%
	1978-79	951.10		-63.62	-6.3%

*Last year of Defined Adult Category.

Summary: The average rate of growth in ADA was higher under the semester calendar than under the quarter calendar, whether we consider the issue in raw figures or percentages: An annual average of 42.89 and 10.3% compared to 30.44 and 3.6%. While the quarter calendar has witnessed more dramatic increases, it has also seen more dramatic decreases than the semester calendar. Thus, increases of 185 and 115.1 ADA are to be found since 1971 (year of transition to quarter calendar), but so are decreases of 27.5, 68.5 and 63.6 ADA. The semester calendar saw only one dramatic increase--135.1; but only two decreases of 13.8 and 6.3. The quarter calendar has not retarded growth, however, as the annual ADA figures are higher, both absolutely and on the average, than those under the semester calendar. That is, the average ADA under the semester calendar was 502.66, compared to 931.65 under the quarter calendar. The difference in base (277.4 vs 706.32) for each calendar helps to explain why the semester calendar has seen growth of 428.92 ADA (154.6%) from 1961 to 1971, while the quarter calendar has seen growth of only 222.07 ADA (30.5%) from 1972 to 1979. At the same time, we should point out that while the quarter calendar has probably not retarded growth, it has not prevented a sharp decrease of ADA (159.37 or 14.4%) from 1976 to 1979. The increase in ADA for 1970-71 to 1971-72 was 22.7 or 3.2%. Thus, there was no immediate significant effect on ADA by conversion from the semester to the quarter calendar.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges APR 22 1983